

## ***The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy – re: The King James Only Controversy by James White***

### **Summary**

This book by James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, Phoenix, Arizona, attempts to show that believing the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is wrong, because:

- There is no 'conspiracy' behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish. Summary answers to White's essential postulates are as follows:

### ***No Conspiracy?***

John Burgon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures as follows:

*“Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel...Corrupting influences...were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine.”*

### ***Uncorrupted Greek Texts?***

Of the early Greek manuscripts that underlie the departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version, Burgon, who collated them, said this:

*“The five Old Uncials' (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text...and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence.”*

### ***Modern Scholarship Trustworthy?***

The departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version were orchestrated mainly by Cambridge academics Westcott and Hort. Of their 'scholarship,' Burgon stated:

*“My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an INSECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL.”*

### ***A Modern Scholar Speaks***

Of White's remaining postulates, this is the verdict of Dr Frank Logsdon, principal scholar behind the NASV, New American Standard Version, match mate to the NIV:

*“I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard...you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!”*

Amen!

## Introduction

The book *The King James Only Controversy* by James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries, Phoenix, Arizona, attempts to show that anyone who believes the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is mistaken, on the grounds that:

- There is no ‘conspiracy’ behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish.

In 1996, a year after White’s book appeared, Dr Peter S. Ruckman of the Pensacola Bible Institute in Florida, published a nearly five-hundred page refutation of *The King James Only Controversy* that James White has never answered<sup>1</sup>. About the time of his book’s publication, James White challenged Dr Ruckman to a debate claiming he could find seven errors in the Authorised Version.

As the one challenged, Dr Ruckman sent White notification of the time and place of the debate and a copy of a Gideon’s AV1611 Bible from which he stipulated that White prove the seven errors that he alleged<sup>2</sup>.

White reneged on the debate and has never issued Dr Ruckman with a fresh challenge. The BBB printed White’s seven alleged errors and Dr Ruckman discussed them in detail. They are Luke 2:22, Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23, Jeremiah 34:16, Revelation 16:5, Acts 19:37 and 1 John 5:7. This work will address these verses either where White cites them first, e.g. in Chapter 4, with respect to Jeremiah 34:16, Luke 2:22, Revelation 16:5, 1 John 5:7 or in Chapter 5, where he attacks Dr Ruckman. Other shortcomings that White alleges the AV1611 contains, in response to his six postulates above will also be discussed subsequently but White’s unwillingness to follow through on his challenge to Dr Ruckman does call into question his ability to substantiate the bold assertion he makes that the AV1611 is “*a great, yet imperfect translation of the Bible.*”<sup>3 p vii</sup>

The above statement raises yet another question. What, according to White, is ‘the Bible?’ Nowhere in two hundred and seventy-one pages does White identify any single volume between two covers as ‘the Bible.’ White regards even the modern bibles as merely translations. And yet he asserts that “*We must be clear on why we believe the Bible to be God’s Word,*”<sup>3 p vi</sup> stressing the importance of “*the Bible... God’s word [requiring] us to be students of that book,*” “*the entirety of the Bible,*” “*the highest standard of truth,*” “*to be men and women of truth and honesty,*” “*Scripture... God’s revealed truth,*” “*Christians are to be lovers of truth,*” “*A true Christian scholar is a lover of truth*”<sup>3 pp vi, vii, viii, 13, 95, 217, 247</sup>.

But nowhere in his book does he specify what “*God’s Word*” is, in a form that is accessible today, though he mentions various versions, Greek editions and manuscript sources. This is surely a point of contention with respect to *The King James Only Controversy*.

Yet White insists that it is the KJV Only advocates – anyone who believes that the Authorised Version *is* the Bible and God’s pure word – who cause disruption and contention

in the local church and are responsible for the destruction of many churches, though none that White can actually identify<sup>3 pp iv-v</sup>.

Nevertheless, bible believers should be concerned over the seriousness of these charges, together with White's main postulates above and prepared to answer them. Thoroughgoing responses already exist<sup>4, 5, 6, 7</sup> in this respect, in addition to Dr Ruckman's detailed work but nothing will be lost by additional study, drawing as appropriate on these earlier analyses, for as Solomon said:

***“Where no counsel is, the people fall: but in the multitude of counsellors there is safety”***  
Proverbs 11:14.

For simplicity, this review will follow the chapters of White's book in sequence, highlighting his main postulates as appropriate and dealing with his criticisms of the Holy Bible as they arise.

Where White has criticised particular passages of scripture as found in the AV1611 with respect to other alternatives, these are listed in the **Appendix**, together with the equivalent renderings of the NIV\*, a translation that White evidently favours over the AV1611 (most of the time) and those of certain translations that as a self-professed “*biblical conservative*” White would most likely *not* recommend\*\*<sup>3 p vii</sup>. These are the JB, the Jerusalem Bible of the Roman Catholic Church, Challoner's Revision, 1749-1752 of the Roman Catholic DR, Douay-Rheims Version, the JR, Jesuit Rheims 1582 New Testament\*\* and the NWT, the New World Translation of the Watchtower heresy.

\*1984 Edition, [www.studylight.org/](http://www.studylight.org/).

The 2011 NIV, [biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/#summary](http://biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/#summary), makes minor word changes in Luke 2:22, Acts 5:30 that do not affect the responses that follow.

\*\*Of necessity an inference, in that White fails to define a “*biblical conservative*”. However, he insists that – with the help various translations - he has<sup>3 p 131</sup> “*written entire books defending salvation by grace through faith alone.*” This statement indicates that White would not support bibles compiled by groups that deny this doctrine.

\*\*\*As available from the internet, [www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml](http://www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml)

An interesting result emerges from the comparison.

White levels criticisms at 241 passages of scripture as they stand in the AV1611, 252 verses in total, of which 24 verses are from the Old Testament. Of that selection, the NIV stands with the AV1611 in only 9 of the 241 passages, or in 4% of the total. However, it lines up *against* the AV1611 with the JR, DR, JB and NWT in 28% of the passages, with the JB and NWT in 70% of the passages and with one or more of the JR, DR, JB, NWT in 89% of the passages that White mentions.

So according to White and regardless of his profession of “*defending salvation by grace through faith alone,*” given that he supports the modern renderings of these passages, at least seven times out of ten where ‘disputed’ passages arise, God gave His words to Rome and Watchtower but not to faithful bible believers who took the AV1611 “*unto the uttermost part of the earth*” Acts 1:8.

It is interesting to see what company a latter-day “*biblical conservative*” is prepared to keep but the Authorised Version does tend to unite former foes in ecumenical oneness, just as its Author did.

***“And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves”*** Luke 23:12.

Unlike James White, this reviewer not only has ‘the Bible’ but possesses the Book in its ‘entirety’ and is aware of the testimony of centuries of jurisprudence in the English-speaking nations to the effect that the Authorised Holy Bible is indeed ‘the highest standard of truth.’

James White has not produced any that is higher.

This review will therefore not hesitate to cite the Authorised Holy Bible as appropriate in its own vindication. This is not “*circular reasoning*” of which White repeatedly accuses bible believers<sup>3</sup> pp vii, 85, n 34, 92, 112, 114, 126, 128, 155, 156, 167, 217, 219, 249 but *scriptural* reasoning, in the light of Paul’s exhortation to the Corinthian Church:

***“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual”*** 1 Corinthians 2:13.

Extracts from *The ‘Whitewash’ Conspiracy* follow, with respect to White’s supposed seven errors in the 1611 Holy Bible.

**White's 7 'KJB Errors' - Luke 2:22, Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23, Jeremiah 34:16, Revelation 16:5, Acts 19:37 and 1 John 5:7**

**From Chapter 4 – “Putting It Together”**

**Luke 2:22**

The AV1611 reading “*her purification*” in Luke 2:22 instead of “*their purification*” has support<sup>8\*</sup> pp 68-69, p 86,<sup>9</sup> pp 150ff from 5-6 Greek manuscripts and the Old Latin but the AV1611 reading is at variance with most of the manuscript and version witnesses. \*See also [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) “O Biblios” – *The Book* p 50 of the uploaded file.

Nevertheless, as Dr Holland explains, “Contextually, the reading must stand as reflected in the KJV. Under the Levitical Law [Leviticus 12:2-4] a woman was considered unclean after giving birth and needed purification.” Dr Moorman<sup>10</sup> states, his emphasis, “The Law in Leviticus required purification **only** for the mother – not the child, not the father...Despite the manuscript support for “*their purification*” the reading is clearly wrong. It contradicts scripture and brings dishonour to Christ.”

Dr Moorman's comment highlights the fact – heavily reinforced by Dr Mrs Riplinger's work<sup>11</sup> – that the manuscripts, versions, patristic quotations and printed editions in the original languages are witnesses to the text of scripture that usually support the AV1611 *against* the modern versions. But these witnesses – such as are extant and have been collated to date – are not infallible. The 1611 Authorised Holy Bible is infallible.

And what James White and others contemptuously refer to as “*King James Onlyism*” is really “*King James AUTHORITARIANISM.*”

This is what White, Kutilek, ‘our critic’ and the rest can't or couldn't stomach. It punctures their egos and threatens their incomes.

Dr Ruckman's comments<sup>2</sup> on Luke 2:22 are as follows.

“(Luke 2:22)...”*Her purification*” is an “error” according to all Alexandrians for the Greek texts say...“*their purification.*” Thus the NIV and NASV are correct in saying “**THEIR** purification.” The only thing wrong with this is that it is a lie. Joseph didn't need any purification according to the Biblical source for the Biblical quotation (Leviticus 12). Only the WOMAN needed to be purified; look at it...

“So here is a case where the AV translators saw a Biblical problem that White didn't see, or didn't want to see, because he was dead set on **FORCING THE BIBLE TO CONTRADICT ITSELF.** If he could use the Greek to do this with he would do it; he did it. If the AV is in “error,” then the NIV and NASV have ten times as bad an error, for they made a false document out of the “Law of Moses.””

In sum, the bible believer can have “*absolute certainty*”<sup>3 p 95</sup> in following the AV1611 for all the verses that White<sup>3 p 68</sup> lists above from Dr Hills's book, regardless of the variations in the TR. How the modern bible critic like James White sorts out the variant readings by a process of “*individual responsibility*”<sup>3 p 95</sup> is problematic.

### **Jeremiah 34:16**

Dr Ruckman has some explanatory comments about Jeremiah 34:16<sup>2</sup>. See below. They are sufficient for a bible believer - though not for James White. He insists that because the different readings are still found in different editions of the AV1611, *“The person who does not make the KJV the absolute authority...has an easy answer; look at the Hebrew text and find out...[and] the Hebrew is plural here...the correct translation is the plural “you,” i.e. “ye,” which is, in fact, the reading found in the AV 1611.”*

But only because *“the Hebrew is plural here.”* According to White *“if we make the KJV the starting point (and this is exactly what radical KJV Onlyism does) there is simply no way of determining the correct text of Jeremiah 34:16.”* He declares<sup>3 p 81</sup> the reading **“he”** to be the error of *“a later English stylist [that]...somehow got past the final editing process and into print”* but expresses his dismay on discovering that the NKJV also says **“he”** in Jeremiah 34:16. However, after consultation with Dr James Price of the NKJV committee, White<sup>3 p 89</sup> assures his readers that *“Future editions of the NKJV will change the pronoun back to “you.””*

Dr Ruckman responds as follows, his emphasis.

*“White is worried about the fact that the Cambridge and Oxford editions of the AV don’t match word for word...[White] even consulted Dr James Price (on the NKJV committee...) to get back to the “original text”...They both agreed the text should say “ye” instead of “he””...*

*“Both apostates (Price and White) insisted that the plural “ye” should be maintained because “he,” being singular, was false. Whereupon they change the “ye”...to “you.” But “you” in [modern] English, is not plural necessarily...[Greek and Hebrew] both have a plural form of “you” [but] Modern English does not preserve this distinction...”*

*“BOTH variants in the AV (Jer. 34:16) were correct grammatically, if one deals with the English text or the Hebrew text. They (“ye” in the Cambridge) were being addressed as a group (plural, Jer. 34:13; as in Deut. 29), but the address was aimed at individual men (“he” in the Oxford edition), within the group. Either word would have been absolutely correct according to that great critic of critics, the word of God (Heb. 4:12-13)...”*

*“No “editor” let anything slip by. White and Price think they are careful “editors.” The translators chose two different ways of saying the same thing, and both of them accorded with the context of the verse, and both of them told the TRUTH. But because they weren’t identical (Cambridge “ye,” Oxford “he”) the old self-righteous, practical atheists – no Alexandrian has any higher authority than his opinions or the opinions of his friends – claimed “error.””*

And once again, White’s claim is shown to be false.

***“He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong”*** Job 5:13.

White refers to Dr Scrivener’s collation of changes in the various editions of the AV1611 but he fails to mention the dates of the changes. Perhaps this is because, like the above examples, they were among the 72% of all textual variants that were finalised under the ministry of Drs Bois and Ward by 1638. Such an early date for the resolution of almost three-quarters of all such variants – and<sup>12 p 170</sup> *“Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention”* – effectively cripples White’s insistence<sup>3 p 79</sup> that *“these changes...represent a sticky problem for the radical proponent of KJV Onlyism...when the KJV is made the*

*absolute standard...once a person has invested the English translation with inspiration itself.”*

Dr Grady<sup>12 pp 227-8</sup> also refutes White’s half-truth<sup>3 p 78</sup> that “*Editions with changes in the text came out as soon as 1612, [others] in 1613...1616, 1629, and 1638*” and his allusion to William Kilburne’s claim in 1659 that “*20,000 errors had crept into six different editions [of the AV1611] in the 1650s.*” Dr Grady states.

*“When all else fails, detractors of the King James Bible will invariably ask their despised opponents, “WHICH Authorised Version do you believe, the 1611, 1613, 1767 or perhaps the 1850?” And while their bewildered victims are pondering this troublesome innuendo (analogous to such nonsense as “Have you quit beating your wife lately?”), they are subjected to an array of staggering statistics. Citing the Evangelical scholar Jack Lewis [also cited by White], Keylock quotes him as stating:*

*“Few people realise, for example, that thousands of textual errors have been found in the KJV. As early as 1659 William Kilburne found 20,000 errors in six KJV editions.”*

*“Reckless statements such as Lewis’ are incredibly misleading as the extent of these so-called “errors” are never explained to be primarily lithographical (printing) and orthographical (spelling) in nature. In 1611, the art of printing was an occupation of the utmost drudgery. With every character being set by hand, a multitude of typographical errors was to be expected...*

*“In addition to printing flaws, there was a continual change in spelling for which to care. Lewis did not inform his readers that there was no such thing as proper spelling in the seventeenth century...*

*“A significant portion of these twenty thousand “textual errors” were in reality nothing more than changing “darke” to “dark” or “rann” to “ran.” Who but a Nicolataine priest [like James White] would categorize as serious revisions the normal follow-up corrections of mistakes at the press?*

*“It is impossible to overstate the duplicity of such critics who would weaken the faith of some with their preposterous reports of tens of thousands of errors in the Authorised Version...In his Appendix A (List of wrong readings of the Bible of 1611 amended in later editions) of his informative work, *The Authorised Edition of the English Bible (1611), Its Subsequent Reprints and Modern Representatives*, Scrivener catalogued but a fraction of the inflated figures of modern scholarship.*

*“Excluding marginal alterations and Apocrypha citings, this author has personally reviewed pages 147-194 and counted LESS THAN 800 CORRECTIONS. And even this figure is misleading when you consider that many of the instances were repetitious in nature. (Six such changes involved the corrected spelling of “Nathanael” from the 1611’s “Nathaneel” in John 1:45-49 and 21:2).*

*“Whereas Geisler and Nix cited Goodspeed’s denouncing of Dr. Blayney’s 1769 Oxford edition for deviating from the Authorised Version in “at least 75,000 details,” Scrivener alludes to less than two hundred as noteworthy of mention.”*

The “*sticky problem*” exists only in the convoluted thought processes of James White and his fellow travellers. Clearly God worked with faithful, bible-believing editors such as Drs Bois and Ward to refine his Book just as He had summoned the scholarly King’s men to translate it in the first place. God was the Principal Editor as well as the Principal Author of the 1611 Authorised Holy Bible and, as indicated earlier, the Book’s own testimony of itself, which White denies, is that it is “*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*” 2 Timothy 3:16a.

### **Revelation 16:5**

White<sup>3 pp 63-6</sup> alludes to [Revelation 16:5], together with a unique reading of Beza's Greek Text in Revelation 16:5 preserved in the AV1611 as **"and shalt be."**

*"Beza did introduce... "conjectural emendations," that is, changes made to the text without any evidence from the manuscripts. A few of these changes made it into the KJV, the most famous being Revelation 16:5, "O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be" rather than the actual reading, "who art and who wast, O Holy one."*

Dr Ruckman has some comments on Revelation 16:5, as follows...

*"Since White wrote his book to justify the sins of the NIV and NASV committees, do you think he was actually worried about "shalt be" in Revelation 16:5? You see the "and" in the verse was found in an early papyrus (P 47): "and..." what? The NIV and the NASV and Nestle and Aland and Hort had to get rid of the earliest papyrus this time. It was an embarrassment because it messed up their sentence. If they had followed their profession ("the oldest and best, etc.) they would have had to give you this: "Righteous art Thou, the Being One, AND the One who was, AND the Holy One." That is one awkward, cockeyed clause, so the "and" ("kai" in the papyrus) had to be dropped. Something originally followed that last "and," and it certainly was not "the Holy One." Undoubtedly, "in the original" (a famous, worn-out, Alexandrian cliché) it read "the One being, and the One who was, AND the One who shall be..."*

*"Now, that is a conjecture, but it is a conjecture in the light of early Greek manuscript evidence that was discarded by Mr Nestle and Mr White. He and his buddies had to violate their own standards to get rid of the AV reading. Standard Operating Procedure in the Cult..."*

*"They never waste their time on any text like they waste it on the English text of 1611. That is the one they hate..."*

*"For those of you who think I am "overstepping" myself: Who inserted "nailed" into Acts 2:23 without being able to find one nail within one hundred verses of the verse (NASV)? There is not one Greek manuscript extant that says "nail" or "nails" or "nailing" or "nailed." But it doesn't bother any Alexandrian except in Revelation 16:5 in an AV. Remarkable, isn't it?..."*

*"We would judge White's extant Greek texts on Revelation 16:5 to be defective, in regards to "shalt be," and this is apparent from the rejected "kai" in Papyrus 47. Why trade in absolute truth for a defective Greek manuscript? The truth is the Lord (vs. 5) had THREE lives (confirmed in Revelation 1:8, 8:8) and the "kai" (and) is found in both those passages. Someone messed with Revelation 16:5 in the Greek texts. It wasn't the AV translators..."*

White is clearly being inconsistent in not highlighting the insertion of "nailed" in Acts 2:23, while complaining about Revelation 16:5 in the AV1611.

Moorman<sup>13 p 152</sup> notes that P47 contains the reading "the Holy One" but he adds<sup>14 p 102</sup> that *"The KJV reading is in harmony with the four other places in Revelation where this phrase is found, 1:4, 8, 4:8, 11:17. Indeed Christ is the Holy One, but in the Scriptures of the Apostle John the title is found only once (1 John 2:20), and there, a totally different Greek word is used. The Preface to the Authorised Version reads: "With the former translations diligently compared and revised." The translators must have felt there was good reason to insert these words though they ran counter to much external evidence. They obviously did not believe the charge made today that Beza inserted it on the basis of "conjectural emendation." They*

*knew that they were translating the Word of God, and so do we. The logic of faith should lead us to see God's guiding providence in a passage such as this."*

The above would satisfy a bible believer with respect to Revelation 16:5 in the AV1611, though not James White.

### 1 John 5:7

White then directs his criticisms<sup>3 pp 60-62</sup> towards 1 John 5:7.

He seeks to undermine the authenticity of this verse mainly by reference to Erasmus's doubts about the passage. He states that "[1 John 5:7]...was found only in the Latin Vulgate. Erasmus rightly did not include it in the first or second editions...he was constrained to insert the phrase in the third edition when presented with an Irish manuscript that contained the disputed phrase...the manuscript is highly suspect, in that it was probably was created in the house of Grey Friars, whose provincial, was an old enemy of Erasmus...we have a phrase that is simply not a part of the ancient Greek manuscripts of John's first epistle. The few manuscripts that contain the phrase are very recent, and half of those have the reading written in the margin. The phrase appears only in certain of the Latin versions. There are, quite literally, hundreds of readings in the New Testament manuscript tradition that have better arguments in their favor that are rejected by both Erasmus and the KJV translators. And yet this passage is ferociously defended by KJV advocates to this day...If indeed the Comma was a part of the original writing of the apostle John, we are forced to conclude that entire passages, rich in theological meaning, can disappear from the Greek manuscript tradition without leaving a single trace...the defenders of the KJV...[present] a theory regarding the NT text that in reality, destroys the very basis upon which we can have confidence that we still have the original words of Paul or John...in their rush to defend what is obviously a later addition to the text that entered into the KJV by unusual circumstances."

Again, White neglects to mention where "the original words of Paul or John" can be found as the preserved words of God between two covers. He adds a note<sup>3 pp 85-86</sup> with respect to "the grammatical argument that posits a problem in the masculine form of "three" and the genders of Spirit, blood and water" and insists that "This is not a very major problem, as "three" almost always appears in the NT as masculine when used as a substantive...this is more stylistic than anything else."

First, White has demonstrated his contempt for, or wilful ignorance of, faithful bible believers such as the Waldenses, whose pre-1611 Latin Bibles, the texts of which date from as early as 157 AD, furnished "unequivocal testimony of a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church, that the celebrated text of the heavenly witnesses [1 John 5:7] was adopted in the version which prevailed in the Latin Church, previously to the introduction of the modern Vulgate." See Wilkinson's citation of Nolan, under **Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare**. (See Wilkinson, [kjb.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html](http://kjb.benabraham.com/html/chapter-2.html))

How can a text of scripture preserved by "a truly apostolical branch of the primitive church," possibly be a late addition? 157 AD is *not* late!

Dr Mrs Riplinger notes<sup>11 p 946</sup> that "The world's leading Erasmusian scholar, Henk de Jonge, finds Bruce Metzger, James White, and others sorely wrong in their appraisal of Erasmus. He states, in his "Erasmus and the Comma Johannem," that White's assertions are patently wrong."

The evidence for 1 John 5:7 as scripture has been summarised elsewhere<sup>8 pp 88-89 319ff</sup> but extracts follow, together with citations from other researchers.

See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) "O Biblios" – The Book pp 63-64, 249ff.

Dr Holland<sup>4</sup> states in refutation of White's disinformation about 1 John 5:7 that "Another example of false information is White's treatment of the "Johannine comma" (1 John 5:7). "If indeed the Comma was a part of the original writing of the apostle John, we are forced to conclude that entire passages, rich in theological meaning, can disappear from the Greek

*manuscript tradition without leaving a single trace” (p. 62).” Without a trace? White thinks it was added in the fifteenth century. Yet, it was quoted by Cyprian in 250 AD, used by Cassiodorus in the early sixth century, and found in the old Latin manuscript of the fifth century and in the Speculum.”*

He has this further detailed study<sup>9</sup> pp 163ff as follows. Dr Holland’s book contains reference citations that have been omitted here.

Note that Dr Holland in his overview of 1 John 5:7 does *not* accept White’s assertion that the grammatical difficulty arising from omission of the verse “*is not a very major problem.*”

*“1 John 5:7 (Johannine Comma) - “These Three Are One”*

*““For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.”*

*“The passage is called the Johannine Comma and is not found in the majority of Greek manuscripts. However, the verse is a wonderful testimony to the Heavenly Trinity and should be maintained in our English versions, not only because of its doctrinal significance but because of the external and internal evidence that testify to its authenticity.*

*“The External Support: Although not found in most Greek manuscripts, the Johannine Comma is found in several. It is contained in 629 (fourteenth century), 61 (sixteenth century), 918 (sixteenth century), 2473 (seventeenth century), and 2318 (eighteenth century). It is also in the margins of 221 (tenth century), 635 (eleventh century), 88 (twelfth century), 429 (fourteenth century), and 636 (fifteenth century). There are about five hundred existing manuscripts of 1 John chapter five that do not contain the Comma. It is clear that the reading found in the Textus Receptus is the minority reading with later textual support from the Greek witnesses. Nevertheless, being a minority reading does not eliminate it as genuine. The Critical Text considers the reading Iesou (of Jesus) to be the genuine reading instead of Iesou Christou (of Jesus Christ) in 1 John 1:7. Yet Iesou is the minority reading with only twenty-four manuscripts supporting it, while four hundred seventy-seven manuscripts support the reading Iesou Christou found in the Textus Receptus. Likewise, in 1 John 2:20 the minority reading pantes (all) has only twelve manuscripts supporting it, while the majority reading is panta (all things) has four hundred ninety-one manuscripts. Still, the Critical Text favors the minority reading over the majority in that passage. This is commonplace throughout the First Epistle of John, and the New Testament as a whole. Therefore, simply because a reading is in the minority does not eliminate it as being considered original.*

*“While the Greek textual evidence is weak, the Latin textual evidence for the Comma is extremely strong. It is in the vast majority of the Old Latin manuscripts, which outnumber the Greek manuscripts. Although some doubt if the Comma was a part of Jerome’s original Vulgate, the evidence suggests that it was. Jerome states:*

*““In that place particularly where we read about the unity of the Trinity which is placed in the First Epistle of John, in which also the names of three, i.e. of water, of blood, and of spirit, do they place in their edition and omitting the testimony of the Father; and the Word, and the Spirit in which the catholic faith is especially confirmed and the single substance of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is confirmed.”*

*“Other church fathers are also known to have quoted the Comma. Although some have questioned if Cyprian (258 AD) knew of the Comma, his citation certainly suggests that he did. He writes: “The Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one’ and likewise it is written of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, ‘And these three are one’.” Also, there is no doubt that Priscillian (385 AD) cites the Comma:*

“As John says “and there are three which give testimony on earth, the water, the flesh, the blood, and these three are in one, and there are three which give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Christ Jesus.”

“Likewise, the anti-Arian work compiled by an unknown writer, the *Varimadum* (380 AD) states: “And John the Evangelist says... ‘And there are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one’.” Additionally, Cassian (435 AD), Cassiodorus (580 AD), and a host of other African and Western bishops in subsequent centuries have cited the Comma. Therefore, we see that the reading has massive and ancient textual support apart from the Greek witnesses.

“Internal Evidence: The structure of the Comma is certainly Johannine in style. John is noted for referring to Christ as “the Word.” If 1 John 5:7 were an interpretation of verse eight, as some have suggested, than we would expect the verse to use “Son” instead of “Word.” However, the verse uses the Greek word *logos*, which is uniquely in the style of John and provides evidence of its genuineness. Also, we find John drawing parallels between the Trinity and what they testify (1 John 4:13-14). Therefore, it comes as no surprise to find a parallel of witnesses containing groups of three, one heavenly and one earthly.

“The strongest evidence, however, is found in the Greek text itself. Looking at 1 John 5:8, there are three nouns which, in Greek, stand in the neuter (Spirit, water, and blood). However, they are followed by a participle that is masculine. The Greek phrase here is *oi martourontes* (who bare witness). Those who know the Greek language understand this to be poor grammar if left to stand on its own. Even more noticeably, verse six has the same participle but stands in the neuter (Gk.: *to martouroun*). Why are three neuter nouns supported with a masculine participle? The answer is found if we include verse seven. There we have two masculine nouns (Father and Son) followed by a neuter noun (Spirit). The verse also has the Greek masculine participle *oi martourontes*. With this clause introducing verse eight, it is very proper for the participle in verse eight to be masculine, because of the masculine nouns in verse seven. But if verse seven were not there it would become improper Greek grammar.

“Even though Gregory of Nazianzus (390 AD) does not testify to the authenticity of the Comma, he makes mention of the flawed grammar resulting from its absence. In his *Theological Orientations* he writes referring to John:

“(he has not been consistent) in the way he has happened upon his terms; for after using Three in the masculine gender he adds three words which are neuter, contrary to the definitions and laws which you and your grammarians have laid down. For what is the difference between putting a masculine Three first, and then adding One and One and One in the neuter, or after a masculine One and One and One to use the Three not in the masculine but in the neuter, which you yourselves disclaim in the case of Deity?”

“It is clear that Gregory recognized the inconsistency with Greek grammar if all we have are verses six and eight without verse seven. Other scholars have recognized the same thing. This was the argument of Robert Dabney of Union Theological Seminary in his book, *The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek* (1891). Bishop Middleton in his book, *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, argues that verse seven must be a part of the text according to the Greek structure of the passage. Even in the famous commentary by Matthew Henry, there is a note stating that we must have verse seven if we are to have proper Greek in verse eight.

*“While the external evidence makes the originality of the Comma possible, the internal evidence makes it very probable. When we consider the providential hand of God and His use of the Traditional Text in the Reformation it is clear that the Comma is authentic.”*

David Cloud supports 1 John 5:7 as follows<sup>6Part 3</sup>.

**“WHITE MAKES AN ISSUE OF THE ALLEGED LACK OF SUPPORT FOR 1 JOHN 5:7.**

*“White largely ignores the powerful arguments which have led Bible believers to accept 1 John 5:7 as Scripture for centuries on end. 1 John 5:7 stood unchallenged in the English Bible for a full six hundred years. It was in the first English Bible by John Wycliffe in 1380, in Tyndale’s New Testament of 1525, the Coverdale Bible of 1535, the Matthew’s Bible of 1537, the Taverner Bible of 1539, the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva New Testament of 1557, the Bishop’s Bible of 1568, and the Authorized Version of 1611. It did not disappear from a standard English Bible until the English Revised of 1881 omitted it.*

*“James White would probably reply, “Sure, Wycliffe translated from the Latin Bible and 1 John 5:7 has always been in the Latin Bible. It was an accident of history. It doesn’t mean anything.” I believe this history means a lot. The fact that the most widely used Bibles through the centuries contained 1 John 5:7 speaks volumes to me. It tells me that God had His hand in this, that it is preserved Scripture. Were the countless preachers, theologians, church and denominational leaders, editors, translators, etc., who accepted the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7-8 of these English Bibles through all these long centuries really so ignorant? What a proud generation we have today! White is correct when he states that long tradition in itself is not proof that something is true, but he ignores the fact that long tradition CAN BE an evidence that something is true, and if that tradition lines up with the Word of God, it is not to be discarded. “Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set” (Proverbs 22:28). There are many reasons for believing 1 John 5:7 was penned by the Apostle John under inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but White’s readers are not informed of this fact and are left with an insufficient presentation of this issue.*

*“White ignores the scholarly defense of the Trinitarian passage published by Frederick Nolan in 1815 - An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament, in which the Greek manuscripts are newly classed, the integrity of the Authorised Text vindicated, and the various readings traced to their origin. This 576-page volume has been reprinted by Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108. The Southern Presbyterian Review for April 1871, described Nolan’s book as “a work which defends the received text with matchless ingenuity and profound learning.”*

*“White ignores the Christ-honoring scholarship of 19<sup>th</sup>-century Presbyterian scholar Robert Dabney, who wrote in defense of the Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7 (Discussions of Robert Lewis Dabney, “The Doctrinal Various Readings of the New Testament Greek,” Vol. 1, p. 350-390; Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1891, reprinted 1967). Dabney was offered the editorship of a newspaper at age 22 and it was said of him that no man his age in the U.S. was superior as a writer. He taught at Union Theological Seminary from 1853 to 1883 and pastored the College Church during most of those years. He contributed to a number of publications, including the Central Presbyterian, the Presbyterian Critic, and the Southern Presbyterian. His last years were spent with the Austin School of Theology in Texas, a university he co-founded. A.A. Hodge called Dabney “the best teacher of theology in the United States, if not in the world,” and General Stonewall Jackson referred to him as the most efficient officer he knew (Thomas Cary Johnson, The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney, cover jacket, The Banner of Truth Trust, 1977 edition of the 1903 original).*

*“White ignores the fact that it was particularly the Unitarians and German modernists who fought viciously against the Trinitarian passage in the King James Bible. For example, in my library is a copy of Ezra Abbot’s Memoir of the Controversy Respecting the Three Heavenly Witnesses, 1 John v. 7 (New York: James Miller, 1866). Abbot, Harvard University Divinity School professor, was one of at least three Christ-denying Unitarians who worked on the English Revised Version (ERV) of 1881 and the American Standard Version (ASV) of 1901. Abbot was a close friend of Philip Schaff, head of the ASV project, and was spoken of warmly in the introduction to Schaff’s history. According to the testimony of the revisers themselves, the Unitarian Abbot wielded great influence on the translation. Consider the following statement by Matthew Riddle, a member of the ASV translation committee:*

*““Dr. Ezra Abbot was the foremost textual critic in America, and HIS OPINIONS USUALLY PREVAILED WHEN QUESTIONS OF TEXT WERE DEBATED. Dr. Ezra Abbot presented a very able paper on the last clause of Romans 9:5, arguing that it was a doxology to God, and not to be referred to Christ. His view of the punctuation, which is held by many modern scholars, appears in the margin of the American Appendix, and is more defensible than the margin of the English Company. Acts 20:28. ‘The Lord’ is placed in the text, with this margin: ‘Some ancient authorities, including the two oldest manuscripts, read God.’...Dr. Abbot wrote a long article in favor of the reading [which removes ‘God’ from the text]” (Matthew Riddle, The Story of the Revised New Testament, Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Co., 1908, pp. 30, 39, 83).*

*“Matthew Riddle’s testimony in this regard is very important as he was one of the most influential members of the American Standard Version committee and one of the few members who survived to see the translation printed. The ASV was the first influential Bible published in America to drop 1 John 5:7 from the text, AND IT DID SO UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF A UNITARIAN. White sees no significance to these matters. I see great significance. White, as do most modern version defenders, ignores the direct Unitarian connection with modern textual criticism and with the textual changes pertaining to the Lord Jesus Christ which appear in the modern versions. We have exposed this connection extensively in our book Modern Versions Founded upon Apostasy.*

*“White also ignores the scholarly articles defending 1 John 5:7 which have been published since the late 1800s by the Trinitarian Bible Society. He also ignores the excellent defense of 1 John 5:7-8 by Jack Moorman in his 1988 book When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text: A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorized Version (Bible for Today, 900 Park Ave., Collingswood, NJ 08108). Moorman gives an overview of the internal and external evidence for this important verse. White also ignores the excellent reply given in 1980 by Dr. Thomas Strouse to D.A. Carson’s The King James Version Debate, in which Dr. Strouse provides an overview of the arguments supporting the authenticity of 1 John 5:7 as it stands in the Received Text. Dr. Strouse (Ph.D. in theology from Bob Jones University) is Chairman of the Department of Theology, Tabernacle Baptist Theological Seminary (717 N. Whitehurst Landing Rd., Virginia Beach, Virginia 23464. 888-482-2287, tbcm@exis.net).*

*“White also ignores the landmark work of Michael Maynard, author of A History of the Debate over 1 John 5:7-8 (Comma Publications, 1855 “A” Ave. #4, Douglas, AZ 85607). It is possible, of course, that he had not seen Maynard’s book prior to the publication of The King James Bible Controversy. Maynard’s book basically summarizes the long-standing defense of 1 John 5:7-8 as it exists in the King James Bible, but White pretends that there is no reasonable defense of the Trinitarian passage.”*

Dr Moorman<sup>14 pp 115ff</sup> summarises the reasons why bible critics reject 1 John 5:7 and cites Dabney's evaluation of the verse as follows. See also this author's earlier work<sup>8 pp 322ff</sup>. See See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) "O Biblios" – *The Book* p 251.

*“The masculine article, numeral and participle HOI TREIS MARTUROUNTES, are made to agree directly with three neuters, an insuperable and very bald grammatical difficulty. If the disputed words are allowed to remain, they agree with two masculines and one neuter noun HO PATER, HO LOGOS, KAI TO HAGION PNEUMA and, according to the rule of syntax, the masculines among the group control the gender over a neuter connected with them. Then the occurrence of the masculines TREIS MARTUROUNTES in verse 8 agreeing with the neuters PNEUMA, HUDOR, and HAIMA may be accounted for by the power of attraction, well known in Greek syntax...If the words [of verse 7] are omitted, the concluding words at the end of verse 8 contain an unintelligible reference. The Greek words KAI HOI TREIS EIS TO HEN EISIN mean precisely - “and these three agree to that (aforesaid) One.” If the 7<sup>th</sup> verse is omitted “that One” does not appear.”*

Moorman adds that “Gaussen says it best: “Remove it, [verse 7] and the grammar becomes incoherent.””

White may disagree but the sources that Moorman quotes provide much more detailed analyses than White does. As indicated, Moorman also gives a detailed analysis of support for 1 John 5:7 as it reads in the AV1611 – see Holland and Cloud above - and refers the reader to Dr Hills<sup>15 pp 209ff</sup> for his explanation of why the verse was possibly omitted from the majority of Greek manuscripts.

Dr Hills refers to Sabellius's heresy of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, which taught that the three Persons of the Godhead were not distinct Persons but identical. Hills concludes that the statement “**these three are one**” in 1 John 5:7 “no doubt seemed to [orthodox Christians] to teach the Sabellian view...and if during the course of the controversy manuscripts were discovered which had lost this reading [by accidental omission], it is easy to see how the orthodox party would consider these mutilated manuscripts to represent the true text and regard the Johannine Comma as a heretical addition.”

Dr Hills states that “In the Greek-speaking East...the struggle against Sabellianism was particularly severe,” resulting in the loss of 1 John 5:7 from most Greek manuscripts, whereas it was nevertheless preserved in the Latin-speaking West “where the influence of Sabellianism was probably not so great.”

White attempts to undermine Dr Hills's analysis of support for 1 John 5:7 as follows<sup>3 p 85</sup>. “Hills is one of the few who seem to have thought through the matter to its conclusion, though he is not quick to bring out the fact that this means the Greek manuscript tradition can be so corrupted as to lose, without trace, an entire reading.” White's contempt for bible believers emerges once again, where he states in this note “Most who defend [1 John 5:7] do so by merely repeating the maxim that the KJV is the Word of God, and hence the passage should be there (i.e. they use completely circular reasoning).”

Again, White ignores his own ‘circularity,’ evident in his own ‘maxim,’ of rejecting AV1611 readings “**by any means**,” 2 Corinthians 11:3a; apparent lack of manuscript support, alleged recension and conflation in the Byzantine “text-type,” Erasmus's notes, “a great treasure” like Codex Aleph (supposedly such) and alleged “harmonization” and “expansions of piety” etc. His note above could be re-worded as follows.

*“I, James White, who reject 1 John 5:7 do so by merely repeating the maxim that the KJV is not the Word of God wherever I can find something that conflicts with it, and hence the passage should not be there (i.e. I use completely circular reasoning).”*

But White is lying about Dr Hills, who gives a comprehensive summary of early sources for 1 John 5:7, including Cyprian, 250 AD, which White wilfully ignored insofar as he had Dr Hills's book in front of him. See Dr Holland's remarks above, in refutation of White's lie.

Moreover, White was clearly too careless to check out the work of R.L. Dabney<sup>8 p 322</sup> who gives a further explanation of how 1 John 5:7 might initially have been removed from early Greek manuscripts, by means that were *not* accidental. See remarks by Whitney and Wilkinson, under **White's Introduction**, to the effect that "*those who were corrupting the scriptures, claimed that they were really correcting them*" and Colwell's statement that "*The first two centuries witnessed the creations of the large number of variations known to scholars today in the manuscripts of the New Testament most variations, I believe, were made deliberately.*"

Dabney states.

*"There are strong probable grounds to conclude, that the text of Scriptures current in the East received a mischievous modification at the hands of the famous Origen. Those who are best acquainted with the history of Christian opinion know best, that Origen was the great corrupter, and the source, or at least earliest channel, of nearly all the speculative errors which plagued the church in after ages...He disbelieved the full inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, holding that the inspired men apprehended and stated many things obscurely...He expressly denied the consubstantial unity of the Persons and the proper incarnation of the Godhead - the very propositions most clearly asserted in the doctrinal various readings we have under review.*

*"The weight of probability is greatly in favour of this theory, viz., THAT THE ANTI-TRINITARIANS, FINDING CERTAIN CODICES IN WHICH THESE DOCTRINAL READINGS HAD BEEN ALREADY LOST THROUGH THE LICENTIOUS CRITICISM OF ORIGEN AND HIS SCHOOL, INDUSTRIOUSLY DIFFUSED THEM, WHILE THEY ALSO DID WHAT THEY DARED TO ADD TO THE OMISSIONS OF SIMILAR READINGS."*

Concerning the Irish Manuscript 61 that White dismisses as "*highly suspect*," attention is drawn to Dr Ruckman's description<sup>8 p 321</sup> of this document.

*"How about that Manuscript 61 at Dublin?"*

*"Well, according to Professor Michaelis (cited in Prof. Armin Panning's "New Testament Criticism"), Manuscript 61 has four chapters in Mark that possess three coincidences with Old Syriac, two of which also agree with the Old Itala: ALL READINGS DIFFER FROM EVERY GREEK MANUSCRIPT EXTANT IN ANY FAMILY. The Old Itala was written long before 200 A.D., and the Old Syriac dates from before 170 (Tatian's Diatessaron).*

*"Manuscript 61 was supposed to have been written between 1519 and 1522; the question becomes us, "FROM WHAT?" Not from Ximenes's Polyglot - his wasn't out yet. Not from Erasmus, for it doesn't match his "Greek" in many places. The literal affinities of Manuscript 61 are with the SYRIAC (Acts 11:26), and that version WAS NOT KNOWN IN EUROPE UNTIL 1552 (Moses Mardin)."*

Dr Ruckman's findings add support for 1 John 5:7 from Tatian and the Old Syriac, 170-180 AD, in harmony with the Old Itala Bibles, whose text dates from 157 AD. Again, hardly "*a later addition.*"

In opposition to all this, White's ally, D. Kutilek, has an article entitled *A Simple Outline on 1 John 5:7* on his site, [www.kjvonly.org/index.html](http://www.kjvonly.org/index.html).

He declares.

*“An Irish monk deliberately fabricated such a manuscript to meet Erasmus’ requirement. This manuscript (no. 61) was copied from an early manuscript which did not contain the words. The page in this manuscript containing the disputed words is on a special paper and has a glossy finish, unlike any other page in the manuscript. On the basis of this **one** 16<sup>th</sup> century deliberately falsified manuscript, Erasmus inserted the disputed words in his 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, and 5<sup>th</sup> editions of the Greek NT, though he protested that he did not believe the words were genuine.”*

“Simple” is the operative word.

- Who was this Irish monk?
- What manuscript did he copy from?
- Who testified about “the disputed words” being “on a special paper” and where is the evidence?
- Why should a forger risk arousing suspicion by use of the “special paper”?
- Even then, how does use of the “special paper” establish unequivocally that the “disputed words” were not in the source manuscript?
- Where is the statement from Erasmus protesting against 1 John 5:7?

It is significant that Kutilek fails to address any of these questions. Unless he does, his assertions with respect to Manuscript 61 must be rejected as spurious.

With incisive comments on much of the above, Dr Ruckman summarises the evidence for 1 John 5:7 as follows with respect to texts and citations<sup>2</sup>, *“If I had debated Flimsy-Jimmy, I would have pulled Which Bible? on him (by David Otis Fuller) and put pages 211 and 212 before the video camera. You see, the King James translators had four Waldensian Bibles on their writing tables in 1611. These Waldensian Bibles had 1 John 5:7-8 in them.”*

See remarks under **Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare** in *KJO Review Full Text* pp 14ff [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php).

Dr Ruckman continues.

*“Watch God Almighty preserving His words. In spite of the negative, critical, destructive work of “godly Conservative and Evangelical “scholars.” AD 170: Old Syriac and Old Latin, AD 180: Tatian and Old Syriac, AD 200: Tertullian and Old Latin, AD 250: Cyprian and Old Latin, AD 350: Priscillian and Athanasius, AD 415: Council of Carthage, AD 450: Jerome’s Vulgate, AD 510: Fulgentius, AD 750: Wianburgensis, AD 1150: Miniscule manuscript 88, AD 1200-1500: Four Waldensian Bibles, AD 1519: Greek Manuscript 61, AD 1520-1611: Erasmus TR, AD 1611: King James Authorized Version of the Holy Bible.*

*“God had to work a miracle to get the truth of 1 John 5:7-8 preserved; He preserved it. You have it; but not in an RV, RSV, NRSV, CEV, ASV, NASV, or NIV.”*

See also David Daniels’s<sup>16</sup> pp 110ff review of the evidence for 1 John 5:7. He states *“157-1600s AD Waldensian (that is, Vaudois) Bibles have the verse\*. It took [the Roman Catholic religion] until the 1650s to finish their hateful attacks...on the Vaudois and their Bible. But the Vaudois were successful in preserving God’s words to the days of the Reformation.”* See remarks above and under **Catholic Corrupters and Centuries of Warfare**.

\*This site<sup>17</sup> is also a good summary of the evidence and researcher Kevin James<sup>18</sup> p 230ff provides a thoroughgoing discussion of 1 John 5:7. See also Dr Mrs Riplinger’s extensive remarks on why 1 John 5:7-8 was cut out of Greek manuscripts in *Hazardous Materials* pp 750ff. She states in summary *“The Greeks who worshipped the gods of mythology and the “UNKNOWN” God, recoiled at a verse which describes the Godhead, then concludes, “This*

*is the true God...” (Acts 17:23, 1 John 5:20). The weak Greek monks and priests caved in and simply omitted the verse which stirred the antagonism of unbelievers.”*

**White's 7 'KJB Errors' - Luke 2:22, Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23, Jeremiah 34:16, Revelation 16:5, Acts 19:37 and 1 John 5:7 Continued**

From *Chapter 5 – “The King James Only Camp”*

**Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23, Acts 19:37**

James White has these comments on Acts 5:30 and Hebrews 10:23<sup>3 pp 225-226</sup>. See below.

Note that the readings that he recommends also match those of the DR, JB, JB, NWT. See **Appendix 1, Table A1**. Note also that he has published his own responses to Dr Ruckman's evaluation of James White's seven 'errors' in the AV1611 on his site, though only with respect to Luke 2:22 and Acts 5:30.

See [aomin.org/ResponseToRuckman.html](http://aomin.org/ResponseToRuckman.html). The reader can judge whether or not White has made an honest and accurate response to Dr Ruckman's evaluation. In this writer's view, White has not added anything of substance to the material in his book on these verses. Detailed comment on his response is beyond the scope of this work but inspection of White's response shows that he has not yet identified any finally-authoritative 'bible' as the pure word of God between two covers, so his later remarks are no further advanced than his recommendation<sup>3 p 7</sup> that Christians “*purchase and use multiple translations of the bible.*” Once again, no doubt James White would be happy to act as the ‘final authority’ for any of the Lord's people bemused over different renderings found in these “*multiple translations.*”

But as Solomon says, “***Seest thou a man wise in his own conceit? there is more hope of a fool than of him***” Proverbs 26:12.

White's comments on Acts 5:30 and Hebrews 10:23 follow.

*“The NKJV corrects the problem seen in the KJV rendering [of Acts 5:30]. Peter did not say that the Jews had slain Jesus and then hung him on a tree. Instead, they put the Lord to death by hanging Him on the tree. It is difficult to see exactly where the KJV derived its translation, as there is no “and” in the text to separate “slew” and “hanged on a tree.”*

*“The KJV translation of Hebrews 10:23 leaves most people wondering as well. The KJV has the phrase “the profession of our faith.” Literally, the first term should be translated “confession,” but it is the KJV's very unusual translation of the Greek term “hope” as “faith” that is difficult to understand. The Greek term appears thirteen times in the TR, and each time it is translated “hope” with this one exception.”*

Dr Ruckman writes<sup>1 p 283, 2</sup> as follows on Acts 5:30, Hebrews 10:23 Acts 19:37, his emphases.

*“Acts 5:30 “is a simple mistranslation<sup>3 pp 81, 225-226, 238</sup>.” The Jackleg's reasoning is that the AV translators thought that Jesus Christ was slain before He was crucified. The silly child surmised this from “whom YE slew and hanged on a tree” (Acts 5:30)...*

*“White's famous “How can this be?”<sup>3 p 131</sup> ...comes out like this “IT IS DIFFICULT TO SEE” (i.e. **difficult for HIM**) exactly where the KJV derived its translation, as there is no “and” in the text to separate “slew” and “hanged on a tree”...*

*“Blazing hypocrisy in action.” “There is no ‘and’ in the text” ...There is no “came” in any Greek manuscript in 1 Thessalonians 2:5 (NASV). There is no article (“the”) in any Greek manuscript “extant” for 1 Corinthians 2:16 (NIV). There is no “was” in any Greek manuscript extant for the third clause of 1 Timothy 3:16 (NASV). There is no “Who had been” in any Greek manuscript on Matthew 1:6 (NASV). So? There is no “God” in any Greek manuscript extant in Acts 7:59 (NKJV). So? So Mr White simply pretended there was*

a problem...where there **wasn't** any problem. He found no fault with the same "problem" in the versions he was trying to sell...

"Here is 2 Samuel 20:12; 1 Samuel 17:51; and 2 Samuel 3:27, 30. Peter, James, and John (Acts 5:30)...knew that David "**slew**" Goliath with a sling and **later** "**slew**" him with a sword...how did [White] fail to see that Abishai was guilty of "slaying" Abner, when Abishai wasn't even in **the vicinity** when **Joab** slew Abner?... "How did Amasa **DIE**, and then **LATER** "**wallowed in blood in the midst of the highway?**"..."

"That is the Hebrew way of stating killing and murder. Often a man is killed and dead, and then a statement is made that he was slain, **later**. He is "slain **before** he is slain"...

"Every Jew in Peter's audience understood the order of the words in the **King James text**. Luke, who was the author of Acts, chapter 5, said in his Gospel, Luke 24:20: "**The chief priests and rulers...HAVE CRUCIFIED HIM.**"

"**They did nothing of the kind.**

"No ruler, or chief priest, put **one** hand to **one** nail, or **one** whip, or **one** crown of thorns, or **one** crucifix during the entire operation..."

"No Jew "**SLEW**" Christ and no Jew "**CRUCIFIED**" Christ.

"It was Roman soldiers who mocked Him, whipped Him, and nailed Him...[but] no Roman soldier could have "**SLAIN**" Christ if he had stayed up twenty centuries... White forgot that Jesus Christ laid down His life (John 10:15) because **NO MAN** (Roman or Jew) could "slay" Him (John 10:18)..."

"The truth is that [the Jews] were "accessories before the fact." So they were **charged** with Christ's murder. That was exactly the case with **Abishai** in 2 Samuel. The Jews put Jesus Christ into a situation where **someone else** could do the "slaying" (John 19:11). This act (John 19:11) was equivalent to the **Jewish leaders** killing (1 Thess. 2:15), crucifying (Luke 24:20), and **slaying** (Acts 5:30) Him: although **they** never touched Him after He picked up His cross. Peter is charging them on **pre-killing grounds**. To all practical purposes, **they** slew Him the moment they passed the death sentence on Him (Mark 14:64), and they did do **that**.

"Abishai slew Abner because Abishai was in "cahoots" with his brother. He, himself, never touched Abner. David killed Uriah with the sword of the children of Ammon [2 Samuel 12:9]. Who didn't know **THAT** but Jimmy White?"

"Total ignorance of Jewish idioms, total ignorance of "accessories before the fact," total ignorance of shared guilt, total ignorance of Scriptural example, and Scriptural revelation, total ignorance of **WHO** actually was involved in the crucifixion, plus total ignorance of why the blame was placed on the Jews."

Dr Ruckman summarises this material in his commentary on Acts<sup>19 p 213</sup>, published in 1974. Why did White ignore it?

See this summary<sup>8 pp 165-166</sup> of Dr Ruckman's comments, with respect to the same objections to Acts 5:30, raised by another bible critic. See [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/) "O Biblios" – The Book p 127.

"Our critic's next "error" is in **Acts 5:30**, where the AV1611 reading "**whom ye slew and hanged on a tree**" should be changed to "whom you had killed by hanging him on a tree" in the NIV. The JB, NWT, Ne and the renderings of all the other Greek texts follow suit, with

minor variation. However, the NIV alone has the additional words “from the dead” which do not appear in any of the Greek editions.

“Of this alteration, Dr. Ruckman states, *ibid* p 213: “The idea behind the juggling (of verse 30) is that the “first aorist middle indicative” and the “first aorist active participle” are supposed to indicate the slaying took place **AFTER** the hanging. But, of course, all of this grammatical twaddling does nothing for the text; “**YE**” in the text is aimed at men who did not even touch a nail, spear, rope, mallet, cross, or hammer. They did not “**SLAY**” Christ **BEFORE** or **AFTER**. He was hung on a tree, and Peter’s remark is going behind the bare act to the **INTENTION** of the elders of Israel when they delivered Jesus over to Pilate. First Aorists and Middle participles are about as relevant to proper exposition of the text as first basemen and middle line-backers.” John 11:53 states “**they took counsel together for to put him to death**” and 1 John 3:15 states “**Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer.**”

Dr Holland<sup>9</sup> p 183 states with respect to Acts 5:30 that, his emphases, “Some scholars object to the phrase, “whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.” They argue that the correct rendering is “whom ye killed by hanging on a tree” and that the conjunction *and* in the KJV misleadingly suggests that the Jews first killed Christ and then hanged his body on the tree [Dr Holland cites White<sup>3</sup> p 225-6 in a footnote]. This suggestion is faulty in that it misconstrues the text of the Authorized Version, making the text say “whom ye slew and **THEN** hanged on a tree.”

“In English, the word *and* does not usually mean a period of time, as is suggested with the addition of the word *then*. The text is not saying that the Jews murdered Christ **and then** placed him on the cross. The word *and* is a conjunction which simply links two thoughts together. As such, it is used as the word *further*. We understand the text to mean that the Jews were responsible for killing their Messiah. Further, they were responsible for having him placed on the cross. This is a proper use of English. When one assumes that the text is stating that the Jews murdered the Lord **and then** crucified him, they are reading their own thoughts into the text. The translation “whom ye slew and hanged on a tree” is just as correct as the translation “whom you killed by hanging on the tree.”

Dr Ruckman proceeds with his answer to White’s objection to Hebrews 10:23 as found in the AV1611.

“The word “faith” here should have been “hope” (Greek *eipidos*, from *eipis*)...

“White’s typical comments are that the AV reading “is difficult to understand” and “leaves most people wondering as well” ...I never met any Christian who was “left wondering” at the “faith” of Hebrews 10:23, especially since the immediate context (vs. 22) and the nearest context are dealing with FAITH (Heb. 11:1-30, 10:22, and 10:38)...

“Hebrews 10:23 is a simple case where a word that normally has been translated one way is now translated another way. Instances in the corrupt Bibles that White recommends are so numerous, no one could list them on five pages. For example, in the NIV, the Greek for “fornication” (Greek *pornei*) is translated as “marital unfaithfulness” in Matthew 5:32, “sexual immorality” in Matthew 19:9, “illegitimate children” in John 8:41, “evil” in Romans 1:29, and “sexual sin” in 2 Corinthians 12:21.

“This was the NIV: six different ways to translate one word, and White says TWO different ways of translating “*eipidos*” is an ERROR. The NIV, that White recommends to high heaven, says that *porneias* is “sexual immorality” twelve times and then says it’s “adultery” in Revelation 2:22...

“The word “hope” in the New Testament, for the child of God, is a word used many times for the Rapture of the Body of Christ, where the Christian will receive a new body... Titus 2:13, 1

*John 3:1-3. Our HOPE is a person...The passage in Hebrews 10:16-25 is NOT Christ coming for any Christian on this earth. The “day” spoken of in 10:25 is a day where Israel is judged (vs. 30), and the Lord’s coming is in judgement (vs. 37) as found in Malachi 4:1-4. Hebrews is aimed at Hebrews. (White could never figure that one out, either)...*

*“Nobody ever held fast to a “profession of hope.” Timothy’s “good profession” (1 Tim. 6:12) before “many witnesses” was his profession of FAITH in Jesus Christ. Notice the identical profession in Hebrews 4:14. Our FAITH in Someone is our profession which we must “hold fast.” You don’t go round declaring “I hope I’m saved, I hope I’m saved, I hope I’m saved.” That profession is worthless. The faith in Christ that the Hebrew is exhorted to “hold fast” in Hebrews 10:23 (“our faith”) is defined in verses 16-22: it is immediate access to Jesus Christ in the third heaven because of His blood atonement...*

*“Perhaps Gerhard Kittel, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, p 531-2, can help White out... “The definition of PISTIS (Faith, more than ninety times in the New Testament) as...in Hebrews 11:1 is quite in keeping with the Old Testament inter-relating of PISTUEIN (to believe) and ELPIZEIN...as well as ELPIS (“hope”)... With PISTIS (faith), ELPIS (hope), this constitutes Christian experience...what is denoted by ELPIS (hope) can be included in PISTIS (faith).”*

*“So the AV had the correct word since it included BOTH words, and White’s doll babies (NIV and NASV) were just sorry displays of Beginner’s Greek Grammar...Correct White’s Greek (eipidos) with the English (“faith”) in Hebrews 10:23.”*

Note that though not a Bible believer, even Kittel acknowledges the AV1611 reading as accurate.

Concerning White’s opinion that *“Literally, the first term should be translated “confession,”* the word **“confession”** is used in the scriptures with respect to confession of sin; Joshua 7:19, 2 Chronicles 30:22, Ezra 10:11, Daniel 9:4 and as **“confess”** in 1 John 1:9 and elsewhere in both Testaments, e.g. Leviticus 5:5, Nehemiah 1:6, Matthew 3:6, Acts 19:18, as **“confessing”** and **“confessed”** respectively. Where it is used in Romans 10:10, and as **“confess”** in verse 9, the context includes the saved sinner acknowledging that the Lord Jesus Christ died for his sins. The word **“confess”** is used several times in the New Testament to denote that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true Messiah, Matthew 10:32, Luke 12:8, John 9:22, 12:42 and by implication He Who would **“save his people from their sins,”** in contrast to **“the law of the fathers,”** Acts 22:3, thus incurring ‘excommunication,’ or expulsion from the synagogue.

The Lord Jesus Christ **“before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession”** 1 Timothy 6:13, when Pilate asked Him a specific question, **“Art thou the King of the Jews...Art thou a king then?”** John 18:33-37. Like John the Baptist, who was also asked specific questions, Jesus **“confessed, and denied not: but confessed”** John 1:20.

**“Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice.”**

Pilate was convinced. See John 18:39.

**“Will ye therefore that I release unto you the King of the Jews?”**

The term **“confession,”** therefore, has particular connotations that differentiate it from the term **“profession,”** even if the distinction may be fine.

For example, Timothy **“professed a good profession before many witnesses”** 1 Timothy 6:13b. His profession was like the Lord’s confession, verse 13 but instead of an answer to a

specific question, such as that posed by Pilate, Timothy's "**profession**" would have been that of what Paul described as "**the unfeigned faith that is in thee**" 2 Timothy 1:5a. Timothy's profession was therefore like that of Hebrews 10:23. The AV1611 is correct in both passages and White is wrong.

Dr Holland<sup>9</sup> pp 190-191, updated from Dr Holland's site has these informative comments on Hebrews 10:23.

*"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)" (Hebrews 10:23).*

*"The common word for "faith" is the Greek word "pistis." However, the word used here is "elpidos" which is translated as "hope."*

*"The KJV translation of Hebrews 10:23 leaves most people wondering as well. The KJV has the phrase 'the profession of our faith.' Literally the first term should be translated 'confession,' but it is the KJV's very unusual translation of the Greek term 'hope' as 'faith' that is difficult to understand. The Greek term appears thirteen times in the TR, and each time it is translated 'hope' with this one exception." (The King James Only Controversy, p. 226).*

*"This does not mean that it is a mistranslation. In fact, the KJV translators stated that they were not bound by strict word counts and that sometimes the context demands that the same Greek word be translated differently. The English words "faith" and "hope" carry the idea of trust, assurance that what has been told will occur. The Thesaurus for my Microsoft Works has for the word "hope," "confidence: faith, reliance, trust, belief, assurance." Further, there is within Scripture a clear connection between faith and hope. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for" (Hebrews 11:1). Notice the clear Biblical connection of faith with hope. The Scripture state, "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Romans 5:2). And in reference to Abraham, the word of God says,*

*"Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sara's womb" (Romans 4:18-19).*

*"We are saved by hope (Romans 8:24) and yet we are saved by grace through faith (Ephesians 2:8). We are told to place our faith and hope in God (1 Peter 1:21). The context of Hebrews chapter ten informs us that we are to have full assurance of faith (vs.22) and the One we are trusting is "faithful" (vs. 23). The context of the Greek word "elpis" in this verse can be expressed by the English words faith, hope, or trust. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, even though it cites the American Standard Version, says of this verse:*

*"Confession of our hope (ASV). And unwavering confession of faith in the living Christ. God undergirds our hope by his own promises, for he is faithful who promised. This then speaks of further affirmation based upon faith in the faithfulness of God" (Nashville: The Southwestern Company, 1962, p. 1420).*

*"Kittel notes the comparison of faith and hope when defining the Greek word "elpis" (hope). He even notes that in the Greek LXX there is an "interrelating" of the two Greek words for faith and hope.*

*"If hope is fixed on God, it embraces at once the three elements of expectation of the future, trust, and the patience of waiting. Any one of these aspects may be emphasized. The definition of pistis as elpizomenon upostasis in H[e]b[rews] 11:1 is quite in keeping with the*

*OT interrelating of pisteuein and elpizein and the usage of the LXX, which has upostasis as well as elpis” (Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament, Vol. II. p. 531).*

*“Faith, trust, and hope are used interchangeably. A related word of elpis (hope) is elpizo. It is translated as “hope” in places such as Luke 6:34 and Romans 8:25. However, it is mostly translated as “trust” in places such as Matthew 12:21 and Romans 15:24. A related word of pistis (faith) is pistuo. It is translated as “believe” in places such as Matthew 8:13 and John 3:16. However, it is also translated as “trust” in 1 Timothy 1:11 (as is another form of it in 1 Thessalonians 2:4 which is translated as “trust”).*

*“The context of Hebrews chapters ten and eleven, demands that this type of trust be translated as “faith” instead of its normal translation of “hope.” Also, since we are told to “hold fast the profession” we must compare the Scriptures to know that our profession deals with “faith” (1 Timothy 6:12).”*

White has clearly not examined Hebrews 10:23 in anything like the depth that Dr Holland has.

Dr Ruckman writes<sup>2</sup> with respect to Acts 19:37, his emphases, *“Here, the Greek word for “temples,” found in all “text-types” and “families,” has been “mistranslated” by the king’s men (1611) as “churches,” instead of “temples.” This is an error, according to Jimbo. However! Such translation is **not** an error in the NIV, that Jimbo recommends. Scores of times, in the NIV, this type of dynamic equivalence is used...*

*“The passages are Matthew 6:22, John 1:16, 6:27, 14:30, Acts 26:20, Romans 1:3, 2:17, 6:4, 8:10, 1 Corinthians 2:4, 5:5, 7:4, 17, 11:19, 12:6, Galatians 2:17, 3:3, 10, 4:21, Ephesians 1:23, 2:3, 4:2, 7, 17, 5:3, Colossians 2:3, 3:14 etc...*

*“No translating committee on earth (for 400 years) have ever translated every Greek word (from any text) **exactly** according to its lexicography (dictionary meaning) as given in a Greek lexicon. All translators “take liberties” in order to get across what **they** think the meaning should be in their language...*

*“Why did [White] allow [the NASV and the NIV] “affirmative action liberties” which he denied to the AV? I will tell you why: a vicious, irrational, Satanic prejudice against the greatest book that ever showed up on this planet. Consider:*

*“When the King’s men substituted “churches” for “temples,” they had just translated the “hieron” of “hierosulos” as “temple” more than fifty times in Matthew-Acts. They knew the root of the word was “temples.” No ignorance was involved. James White pretended they erred through ignorance. He erred through ignorance...*

*“Jimbo’s NIV had just committed this same dastardly “error” in the same chapter, for right at verses 39 and 41 we read “assembly” (NIV) for “church.” But this word was “ekklesia.” The NIV had just translated it as “church” (or “churches”) twenty-two times in Matthew and Acts. Why? If “ecclesia” means “assembly” – and so the NIV and NASV translate it in Acts 19:32, 39, and 41 – what is this same word doing standing as “church” in the rest of the book of Acts and the Pauline Epistles?...*

*““Church” is a dynamic equivalent for “ecclesia.” It is **not** “formal equivalence.” The AV translators **WISELY** chose – intentionally, with full knowledge – “churches” at Acts 19:37 to show you that the heathen who worship female goddesses (see the context!) not only have “temples,” but “churches,” as in St Peter, St Michael’s, St Jude’s, the Lateran, etc. They simply gave you an advanced revelation “not found in the original Greek”!*

“Poor old Jim White will die declaring the NIV can do things like that, but if the AV does it is an “error”...”

In other words, White is ‘inconsistent’ and has a ‘double standard.’

Alan O’Reilly

January 2011

---

## References

- <sup>1</sup> *The Scholarship Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Professional Liars?* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1996
- <sup>2</sup> *Bible Believers Bulletin*, September 1995-March 1996. The September and December 1995 issues carried the details of Dr Ruckman’s response to White’s challenge
- <sup>3</sup> *The King James Only Controversy, Can You Trust the Modern Translations?* by James R. White, Bethany House Publishers, 1995
- <sup>4</sup> [www.biblebelievers.com/Holland1.html](http://www.biblebelievers.com/Holland1.html), Thomas Holland
- <sup>5</sup> [av1611.com/kjbp/articles.html](http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles.html), Will Kinney, [av1611.com/kjbp/articles/whitney-kjoc.html](http://av1611.com/kjbp/articles/whitney-kjoc.html), Tom Whitney
- <sup>6</sup> [www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm](http://www.wayoflife.org/fbns/examining01.htm), David Cloud. Page no longer available
- <sup>7</sup> [www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html](http://www.av1611.org/kjv/ripwhit1.html), Gail Riplinger
- <sup>8</sup> “*O Biblios*” *The Book* by Alan O’Reilly, Covenant Publishing Ltd., 2001. This work is available online, [www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/](http://www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/). The A4 format of the online version has changed the page numbers from those of the hard copy
- <sup>9</sup> *Crowned with Glory* by Dr Thomas Holland, Writer’s Club Press, 2000. See this site, [www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb](http://www.sovereignword.org/index.php/defense-of-the-traditional-bible-texts-and-kjb)
- <sup>10</sup> *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version, A Closer Look! B.F.T. #1825* by Jack A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1990
- <sup>11</sup> *In Awe of Thy Word* by G.A. Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 2003
- <sup>12</sup> *Final Authority* by Dr William P. Grady, Grady Publications, 1993
- <sup>13</sup> *Early Manuscripts and the Authorized Version*
- <sup>14</sup> *When the KJV Departs from the “Majority” Text – A New Twist in the Continuing Attack on the Authorised Version B.F.T. #1617* by Jack. A. Moorman, The Bible for Today, 1988
- <sup>15</sup> *The King James Version Defended* by Edward F. Hills, The Christian Research Press, 1973, [wilderness-cry.net/bible\\_study/books/kjv-defended/](http://wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/)
- <sup>16</sup> *Answers to Your Bible Version Questions* by David W. Daniels, Chick Publications, 2003
- <sup>17</sup> [www.1john57.com/1john57.htm](http://www.1john57.com/1john57.htm)
- <sup>18</sup> *The Corruption of the Word: The Failure of Modern New Testament Scholarship* by Kevin James, Micro-Load Press, 1990.
- <sup>19</sup> *The Book of Acts* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1974